Remembrance.

Reference:—

Shimoga Deputy Comrs. Docket No: 721/683
of 29th February 1888.

Chintamanikoor was originally the Shanbogue of Devarahalli Firka consisting of 11 villages in the Chennagiri Taluk. On his application about the year 1861 his younger brother Rangappa was appointed Shanbogue of the above Firka; and ever since, the said Rangappa has been the officiator. At the permanent settlement of the Shanbogues allowances, the above 11 villages were divided into five

the following
four circles.

	Circle	Revenue R. a. P.	Pucka Potai R. a. P.
1	Chickawadi and 3 other villages	2253 — —	82 — 8 —
2	Kirchoodi & another village	2743 — —	93 — — —
3	Devarhalli & two other villages	2485 — —	87 — 4 —
4	Soogdalli and another village	1294 — —	83 — 8 — —
		9779 — — —	346 — 4 — —

The Amildar was therefore ordered to select competent members in the Shanboguee family to be appointed for the above 4 circles. The Amildar examined the following persons on the subject. ——

1 Ramyatha the present Accountant
2 Ramachendrappa, elder brother of the above.

G. R. S. [X-5]

Previous references.

1887-88

192 .

(L.R)

File No. 41-87

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

M Part B for August 1888

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Shanthosha Sathanapa of Chikodi against Shanthosha of the said Circle in Chennapini Taluk —

To the Deputy Commissioner, Belgaum.

No. 3221 B. 5-8-1888.

P 56

Ordering him to place the petitioner in Charge of the Office if found Qualified and if he is not Qualified or is yet, a Separate Gramasta from the petitioner, may be appointed other than the Complainant

WD 223 GPL—20,000—12-5-20

Countersigned

for

Secretary to Government

Remembrance.

Reference:-

Shimoga Deputy
Comr's Docket No. 721
683
of 29th February 1888.

Chintamani Rao was
originally the Shanbogue
of Devarahalli Firka
consisting of 11 villages
in the Chennagiri
Taluk. On his application
about the year 1861,
his younger brother
Rangappa was
appointed Shanbogue
of the above Firka;
and ever since,
the said Rangappa
has been the
officiator. At the
permanent settlement
of the Shanbogues
allowances, the
above 11 villages
were divided into
five

the following
four circles.

Circle	Revenue R. a. P.	Pucka Kolagi R. a. P.
1 Chickawade and 3 other villages	2253 — —	82 — 8 —
2 Kiscawade & another village	2743 — —	93 — — —
3 Devarhalli & two other villages	2485 — —	87 — 4 —
4 Soogkalli and another village	1294 — —	83 — 8 — —
	9779 — —	346 — 4 —

The Amildar was therefore ordered to select competent members in the Shanboguee family to be appointed for the above 4 circles. The Amildar examined the following persons on the subject. —

1 Ramyatta the present Officiator.
2 Ramachendrabba, elder brother of the above.

3 Karadeka, another elder brother of No: 1

4 Srinivasayya, son of No: 3.

Rangappa stated that, since he was satisfactorily performing the duties of the whole 11 villages for so many years, he was reluctant to give up any of them in favor of other members, that, if he could not be continued in the entire charge as heretofore, he had no mind to perform the duties of any circle at all; nor would his sons consent to such an arrangement; and that, if necessary, he would perform the duties of 2 Circles, and get his eldest son Karappa to officiate as the [redacted] Shanbogue of the other 2 Circles through [redacted] a Competent Commu-

Ramachendrappa stated that he did not want any of the circles to be registered either in his own name, or in that of his son Lakshmanappa.

Narsappa stated that, as he was too old, and as his eldest son was a Patél, his 2nd son might be placed in charge of any one of the above 4 Circles.

Srinivasa Raya, 2nd son of Narsappa, could make no statement on the subject.

The Amildar simply submitted the result of [redacted] enquiry for the

Deputy

Deputy Comm.rs Orders
on the 6th August 1879.

The Deputy Comm.rs
ordered the Auditor
to select competent
men and recommend
them to be appointed
The Auditor accordingly
recommended the
following persons:—

Headmen
Mundas & Pattidars
appointed

1 Sahadhamajha con 2 Pattidars } For Circle No: 1
2 Ramachandrajha }

2 Narsajha Con of the present Officiator } do No: 2
Ramajha —

Present Officiator appointed —

2 Ramajha, the present Officiator } do No: 3

4 Seetharamma another Con of the present Officiator } do No: 4

The 1st & 2nd being minors, the present Officiator was given time till the 20th March, '80, to produce competent Zemindars for them, to be recommended by the Commanding Officer, who

has made the following observations on the Amildar's Potaki takta":—

"The present Hading Shanbogue nominates the following persons to the several circles under protest:—

1 Subbiamaiha Kukdar Rangappa's nephew.

2 Ramappa Kukdar's son.

3 Kukdar Rangappa himself.

4 Seshanaina Kukdar's son.

1st, 2d are aged about 12 years, & the 4th about 7. The Patawari states in the name of Rangappa, and one of his nephews Seenappa, a minor of 16 years of age, claims a share, but Rangappa says that Seenappa's father (Ramappa), having taken for his share Devarhalli Potele, relinquished his right to the Shanbogue in favor of

× Alias Eramarasaya.

of himself and his brother Ramachandrappa and that therefore Seenappa has no right to the Shanbogue

On the Amildar's report about the appointment of Goomastahs for the minors, in his Letter No. 439 of the 31st July 1880, the Deputy Comr. made the following order, on the 12 August 1880:—

"Ramachandrappa and Bhimanna are appointed Goomastahs for minors Narsappa and Sattaramanna respectively. Venkappa cannot be appointed Goomasta for Lakshamakka, as he was dismissed from the educational depart, and told me a lie to begin with."

As no Goomasta on behalf of minor Lakshamakka was produced up to August 1883, Rangappa continued to perform the

the duties of Circle
No: 1. In August 1885,
Lakshamappa produced
a Gomasta named
Bheemarayya, and
requested that the
Gomasta might
be put in charge
of this Circle No: 1,
until C. he would be able
to perform the
duties himself.
The Amildar, on
the 19th September
1885, recommended
that the above
arrangement
might be sanctioned.
The Deputy Comr:
sanctioned it -
temporarily, - and
ordered the Amildar
to produce the
Gomasta before
the Joint Judiciary
Officer, for, confirmation.
In December 1885
Rangappa

Rangabba petitioned
the Deputy Comr.
stating that his nephew
Lakshamanabba was
registered for No: 1
Circle at his own
request, as he had
no other member
available to be put
in charge of it; that
an outsider whom
Lakshmanabba
proposed to be
appointed as his
Gomasta, ought
not to be appointed
in justice to himself;
and praying that
he might be continued
in charge of No: 1
Circle in addition
to his own, until
Lakshmanabba
would be able to
officiate himself.

The Amildar
recommended that
Rangabba might
be continued in
charge

charge of No: 1 Circle
till the end of the
official year.

At the end
of the official
year, Lakshmanappa
petitioned the Amildar
that he would
personally discharge
the duties of his
Circle No: I. But
his father Rama-
-chandrappa petitioned
the Amildar that,
as his son Lakshmanappa
was still unfit
to personally
look after the
duties, one M. Kalappa
might be appointed
his Goomasta
for about six
months. The Amildar,
accordingly, on the
18th May 1936, recom-
-mended that the
application

application might be complied with.

The Deputy Com.r in reply, on the 3rd July 1886, ordered that he would finally settle the matter during his next inspection of the taluk.

No. 1591

On the 20th August 1886, the Dy: Com.r issued an order to the following effect:—

"Pukdar Rangappa agreed to the appointment of Lakshamappa to the Circle No: 1 under protest, as stated by the Jamabundy officer on Gotakitakte. In July 1879 the said Lakshamappa's father Ramachendrappa deposed that he did not want any of the circles for himself or his son Lakshamappa. At the Gokakgotakki settlement, Rangappa prayed that out of the 4 circles, 2 might be registered in his own name, and 2 in the

the Name of his
son. Therefore it
cannot be concluded
that Rangappa
permanently gave
up his right to
No: 1, Circle. Rangappa
will continue in
charge of this Circle
as heretofore, and
Lakshamappa
will be directed
to contest his right,
if any, by a
regular suit."

Against the
above order,
Lakshamappa
has appealed to
the Dewan on the
31st January 1888,
on the following
grounds:—

(1) That though
Rangappa was
performing the duties
of the Circle 11 villages,
still

still the right belonged to the whole family.

That at the Potaki settlement the villages were divided into 4 circles, one of which was registered in the Appellants' names.

That the former Dy: Com^r ordered that the Appellants Circle should be made over to Hunia by Rangotea, but the latter disobeyed and persistently retained the charge.

That the present Dy: Com^r subsequently decided that the Appellant was not entitled to the charge in dispute.

On the 23 March 1888 the Appellant has filed a supplemental petition, in which he urges the following principal points:—

That Appellant and Respondent Rangotea and the latter's sons Hunia & Teatawaiaki are

are contained on the undermentioned genealogical tree:—



That Rangayya in his petition of 23rd Dec. 55 to the Dy. Com. acknowledged appellant's right to the Firka.

That the fact of the appellant's father Ramachandrappa having declined to have a circle registered in his own name or in that of appellant in 1879, cannot deprive his family of the hereditary right.

That Rangayya has not a right superior to that of appellant, in fact Rangayya has lost his right by having suffered imprisonment. The enclosed original endorsement granted by the then Asst. Col. Hoy, of 20th December 70 shows that Col. Hoy declined to give an appointment to Rangayya.

That appellant being now of age, he ought to be placed in charge of the Circle in dispute, to which he is justly entitled.——

According

According to Respondent Rangappa's admission recorded on the Potakitakta by the Inquiring Officer in 1880, the Appellants' father Ramachandrotha and Rangotha (Respt.) were equal Hukdars.

The following is a translation of Ramachandrotha's statement in 1879:—

"I do not want the Chandragwadi of a Circle. I have a son of 10 years of age, named Lakkanna. I do not want it in his name either."

In Petition dated 26th Dec. 1885 presented by Rangotha to the Dy: Com^r, he says as follows:—

"On my representation that I cannot get a proper person to do the work of the charge of my elder brother's son Lakkanna the during minority, and that I should continue to do the work in addition to my own duties, my request was granted. Now I hear Ramanna nominated by

by my elder brother
Ramachandrabhatta, has
been appointed Comarta
& my nephew Kattabhatta
I have caused no inconvenience
to the Circar cost by
my having done the work
hitherto. I therefore
pray that I may be
continued in charge of
Kattabhatta's Circle
until he may be able
to enter upon the duties
personally. If ordered,
I am also ready to
pay a portion of the
Potaki allowance
for the Ravanadar's
maintenance. I am
prepared to pay whatever
the newly appointed
Comarta will allow
the Ravanadar to
take out of the
Potaki allowances.
The Almildar is
pressing me much
to make over the
accounts &c. of
my nephew's Circle
to this newly appointed
Comarta. I beg therefore
that the order about
to

6 17.

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~*

to the Talati, may be cancelled."

Draft for approval

Recite the facts briefly & state that Peter. Layamatha Jan of Ramachandrathe is the Registered Hukdar Officiator of Circle No 1 in Comte Peter Rangatha has been his Gumasta, since the ~~Partition~~ Pottiga sett., owing to the minority of the Hukdar — That Rangatha regarded himself as Gumasta is quite clear from the Records & Especially from his Petn. of 23 Decr 1885 — His attempt now to usurp the office & in his own right is most reprehensible and must fail. Under such circs the Dep Coll's ~~[illegible]~~ ~~to reject & cancel~~ his order No 591 of 30 Augt 1886 is Cancelled & ~~[illegible]~~ Layamatha must be placed in charge of the office if found qualified therefor. If he be not quite qualified he must be allowed to exhibit temporarily a Gumasta other than the Comte Peter Rangatha

27/7/88

Amsterdam

19/3/55



No. 805

Mysore Dewan's Office,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Official Memorandum.

+ not in the file. 44 41 - 87 - 1

The accompanying Petition No. 7994, dated 3rd January 1888 received at the Dewan's Office from Subbarayappa Lakshmanappa of Chikmoodla Sirsi Shimoga District

is forwarded, together with its Same enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District, for disposal.

BANGALORE,
2nd January 1888.

Draft

By Order,

for Secretary.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-1-88.—1,000.

Transfer to 721 B 1883

2nd January

/

(General Serial No. 29.)

19

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE. 8915 12 MAR 88

188

From The Asst. Commr. Shimoga Division

Lr 41-87-2

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 29th February 1888

Despatched 9-3-88

Received

Enclosures No. Five Papers

General No. 771 } 1887.8
Mil. No.

Under Secretary's Docket dated 3/5th Submits herewith a petition dated 22nd Feby 1888 of Shamboga Sankaranarayana for Revision of Proceedings.

In returning the petition together with its 12 enclosures received with the above, have the honor to forward herewith the entire records connected with the Shamboga.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient
Servant

Rejd
12/3

Lr Submitting
Orb
15-3-88

Rejd
15/3

Recd
16/3

1/579

20. 18

(General Serial No. 31)

1888.

From

241-87-3

To The Deputy Commissioner Shemoga District.

Dated 7th April 1888.
Despatched 7th Spirit
Received

Enclosures No.

~~General No~~
Court No. 63

His No: 721/683 dated 2nd Feb-ruary 1888, Submitting records connected with the Complaint of Shanbhague Lakshmappa of Chikkawoodé Firka, Chennagiri Taluk.

Petition No: 3679 dated and Telegram dated 2nd Instant from ~~Shanbhague Lakshmappa~~ Nagappa Ramappa are herewith forwarded to the Dy. Comr. of Shemoga with the intimation that the hearing of this Case is adjourned to 8th June 188 — which fact should be intimated to Ramappa. The Case appears a suitable one for amicable adjustment and if such adjustment is not made before 8th June, then

both parties will be heard and the case will be decided upon its merits. In the meantime the Deputy Commissioner is requested to endeavour to effect an amicable Settlement, if possible.

"By Order"

Draft

Secretary

(General Serial No. 21.)

21

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 1570 30 JUN 88

188 S.

From The Deputy Commissioner Shimoga

L 241-87-4

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 20th May

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. -

General No. 111 / No. 165 | 188 S. 59

Sir,

With reference to your Circular No. 62 of 30th March last forwarding a Petition and a Telegram from Sadiq Pangaiha in connection with the Thandoji of the Chikka Vida Taluka Circle of the Channapatna Taluka and stating that the case stands adjourned to 8th June 1888 and requesting to endeavour to effect an amicable settlement

before that date, I have the honor to state that on receipt of the order, the date of hearing was duly communicated to both the parties and they were further told to appear before me at Chennagiri when I intended to dispose in the course of this month as already arranged, but any programme having subsequently changed, I issued another notice for their appearance on the 25th instant at Honnali. On some of the parties appeared on this date. I have again fixed the case for hearing at Chennagiri on the 5th June and issued notices to both parties to appear before me on that date when I shall endeavour to settle the case by compromise as ordered by Government.

I have to request that the hearing before the Revenue may be adjourned to some distant date in July.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

H. Narasimha Rao

Deputy Commissioner.

1
P. 19

R.

(General Serial No. 30) Petition 23.

1888.9.

From

R 4-875

To

Secretary Senate

Secretary Senate

Dated 19-6-88

Delivered

Received 15/7/88

Enclosures No.

~~General No.~~

Court No. 677

Letter No. 111 of 30th May 1888, regarding the ~~Secretary~~ deputy connected with the Secretaryship of Chitral and Asia to the Secretary Senate

---

With reference to the above, I am to say the case in question has been ~~fixed~~ posted for hearing on the 27th inst., and request that the parties may be informed accordingly.

Petition from Nilkanta Raja is herewith forwarded, to be submitted with the proceedings in the case.

I am &c

R. Wilson

Officer

(General Serial No. 81.) 24

1884

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
17 JUN 88
75

From The Deputy Commissioner Chamrajnagar Circuit

To L R 41-8 7-6

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 12 4
Despatched 22 June
Received 23

Enclosures No. 2 Papers

General No. 1442 | 1884 S. D.
Pol. No. 1353

In continuation of my letter No. 111 dated 1570 5th Pilkuni, requesting the reinvestigation by the Chief Additional Civil Chamrajnagar case pending before the Dewan, I have the honor to return the Petition Register 3649 and Telegram dated 5th March 1888, received with your above-cited letter No. 3 dated 7th April last, together with the entire records in the case

A 15/6

and to state that the petitioner appeared before me in the 3rd Instant at Mahelmuri. I perused the Petition at great length in the merits of the case and tried to get Rangasha to agree to giving up Civil Suit but his stubborn the Petitioner. Rangasha remained adamant will to come to terms.

2. The Petitioner may be at liberty to file an affidavit before me, returned herewith duly executed.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner.

(General Seal No. 31.)

188 8.9

From The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 10th June 1887.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 1570 | 188 8.9

Chief Secretary Desires
to draw attention to
Dewan's Reg. letter
dated 27th April 1887
Dewan Requesting
the Withdrawal of the
Proceedings connected
with the Arrangement
of the Civil Judicial
and intimating that
the case has been posted
for hearing on the 27th
Proximo —

With reference to the
above minute to inform
you that the Proceedings in the case
herein forwarded in the

31
Office letter No 143 dated 12th
Instant - Notices to the parties interested
to the parties interesting that the case
has been fixed for hearing on the
27th Instant.

2. A Petition from Sales Inspector
received with the above is herewith
forwarded —

[illegible]

EIGHT ANNAS
EIGHT ANNAS

This Petn together with delegn and
memo will be forwarded to
the Deputy Commissioner
with the intimation that the
hearing of the case is fixed
8th June '08 - which fact will be
intimated to Rangoon -
The case appears a suitable
one for adjustment, and
if that adjustment is not
made before 8th June the Court
hopes both the learned Counsel
will be directed when it meets
in the meantime the Deputy Commissioner

Received
10/6/08

26

SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAYS.

Tl. 5a.

LICENSED TELEGRAPHS.

MESSAGE FORM.

Class.	XP	Local No.

To (Station)	Mysore	From (Station)	Harihar

No.	Words.	Time tendered for transmission (Railway time.) Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
27	21	20	10	5	Urgent

To (Person)

The Chief Engineering Railways Engineer to the Govt

From (Person)

1	2	3
4 Short-	5 and	6 typical
7 time	8 to	9 estimate
10 petition	11 following	12 alignment
13 proc-	14 Unavoidable	15
16	17	18
19	20	21
22	23	24
25	26	27
28	29	30
31	32	33
34	35	36
37	38	39
40	41	42
43	44	45
46	47	48

Signature of sender.

Received From

At Hrs. Mts. on the

By

Sent To

At Hrs. Mts. on the

By

Date

Signaller in Charge.

41

½

23-3-86

one Rm

one Rm

To

adjournment to
30th march 1888
J Rm

23/3.

L. Stokes Esqr. C. of S. 3679

Dewan to the Hon'ble the
Maharaja of Mysore.

Civil Miscl. Appeal of
Lakshmanappa Basappa
Shanbhoge of Devarahally
Magani Chikkamode
Taka Channagiri Taluq
Shimoga District.

Shimoga Stamps.

1. That your humble Petitioner
respectfully begs leave to submit this
Supplemental Petition to that of 30th
January 1888 Appealing against the
unjust Order of the District Officer
Shimoga passed on the 5th July 86
which Petition succeed in his
previous Petition and to state that
certain circumstances which ought
to have been brought to light in the
case were by oversight omitted
therein, which Petitioner now
solicits permission to bring to notice
and to which he respectfully invites
Your Hons' attention before passing
Orders in the case, the Hearing of which
has been posted to this date.

III

2. On a due representation of the Case and the reports made by the Amildar on the subject, Petitioner was referred vide Order No 691 of 15th August 86 to a regular suit for the recovery of the Arrear and Account of the Sirka - with further observation, that Petitioner's father in 1879 gave a deposition before Chinnappa Amildar to the effect Neither himself nor his son, enjoyed the Sirkarsha Office - and that as Ranappa long discharged the duties of the Sirka from the Minority, he cannot now be made to leave the Office to the Petitioner.

3. With due deference to the above Order, Petitioner prefers to submit that Petitioner's Case was not at all sifted by the Deputy Comr. nor all the papers on the subject perused - Hence the Order in the face of the Records stated are not well grounded. Very shortly saying with the Circumstances of the Case has been made - For in a petition submitted to the Deputy Comr by Ranappa on the 20th December 85 copy of which, Petitioner has already filed with his former Petition - Ranappa

II

Mr. Justice Cunningham acknowledged Petitioner's claim to the Firka, but stated that his objection chiefly lay in Kandayyan Dipler's and Accounts & the Karaiyar Panchayat Accounts as decided by Pte. and that his decision in particular was that he should be allowed to continue to the ends of the Firka till Petitioner's case - and that it was quite prepared to give as much share of the Profit if not more than that the other Panchayat has offered to pay to Petitioner. The Deputy Commissioner appears not to have seen this portion of the record on the Subject, else he would not for one moment have passed such orders as are under reference.

4. Further the Deputy Commissioner appears to have throughout entertained one sided view of the case - for he formerly drew forward the claims of Kanagappa's Party by reference to the deposition given by Petitioner Father and Kanagapa Petition dated 2nd January 1880 & to the Assistant Commissioner praying for his appointment for all the Firkas. And says in his Order dated 6th June, that the fact, (the appearing from the Police Register and the reference just mentioned of Kanagappa's party decided the Favour of the Firka in Dispute

T.

Kenji made out in Petitioner's name do not meet Ranjeeja from his claim to the Dika. On the other hand, no a portion of consideration has been returned to the claim of the Petitioner. It was equally justifying on the part of the deputy Commissioner to have given a sufficient weight & attention to the deposition of the Petitioner's father in law. For if Ranjeeja's desire to have the transfer made out in Petitioner's name do not, as is asserted by the deputy Commr, in any way interfere with his claim to the Dika, much less would the said deposition injure the interest of the Petitioner's father or the Petitioner in connection with the right to the hereditary Office.

5. The deputy Commissioner has totally failed to see that Petitioner has as much claim to the Office as Ranjeeja has Dik - Any more - the appointment is not an acquisition in Ranjeeja's life but on the contrary it has come down from a series of ancestors. Besides, Ranjeeja has decided against all claims, even of the

Tarkar keeping him. He has suffered imprisonment and the present Petition and the General Circular issued by Govt. on the subject of Khandesh and Patan Appointments do not sanction his retention in public service. As proof of this he has already received an Endorsement No 97 of the 28th Jan. 1870 to reply this application, from the then Sheriff Commissioner Colonel Hay stating plainly him that he cannot be entertained in public service. Or keep to Enclose herein the Endorsement in Original (for kind perusal and return when no longer required)

6. That throughout the case only the dark side of the question has been represented by the lower Authorities.

7. That Petitioner under the foregoing circumstances of the case begs leave to state that as he is now of a proper age and qualification and in consequence humbly solicit that your Honor may be graciously pleased


Lukshmappa
Chinnamaney Rao (deceased)
Lakshmappa Patail of Rangoonakully
Hursappa (dies)
Rangappa Patail of Devanhully
Seenappa not employed
Timma Rao died
Ringanna not employed
Ramachandra Rao
Lukshmappa Pr. (Plaintiff & Appellant Barnard Shanbogue of Chickawoodé Pirka) X
Rangappa Shanbogue of Devanhully Pirka
Hursappa 2d Dept. Shanbogue of Herodé Pirka X
Seetharamiya 3rd Dept. Shanbogue of Kakunir Pirka X
Krishniya not employed

Superintendent

Deputy Commissioner

Secretary

Read:-

Petition No: 8224 of the
21st January 1888 from
Executive of Chichoode,
Chemagoi Taluk.

Petition No: 3699 of the
20th March 1888 from
Rangappa, Madiga of
Devarahalli.

Petition No: 3679 of the
22nd March 1888 from
the above Executive.

Vernacular Records
submitted with the
Chemagoi Dy: Coms:
Docket No: 421 of the 20th
February/88 688

Letter No: 146 of the 12th
June/88 from the Chem
Dy: Com:

Order 5/7/8/188

Ad 3221/56

It is ordered
the vernacular
read above
Rangappa to
the Role Cha
of Devarahall
consisting of
in the Chem
Taluk, do
of Annis
the Sirs
of the S

Ad 41-87-8

family equally entitled
to the office. At the
Pudka Potagi Settlement
in the year 1879, these
11 villages were divided
into 4 circles. The
Amildar of the taluk,
after consulting all
the members of the family,
recommended and the
Dy: Com^r sanctioned the
following nominations
to the several circles:—

1 Surendra son of } For No 1
Ramachendrappa }

2 Narappa eldest } —— 2
son of Rangappa }

3 Rangappa —— " —— 3

4 Seetharamma } —— 4.
son of Rangappa }

Out of the above,
2 & 4; being minors,
Masters had to be
inted on their
For the 2 & 4,
tors were duly
ed then & there;
no Nominate
roduced on behalf
ed the year 1885,
ppa performed
Circle No: 1
e to his case
August 85,
produced
Narayya to

the appointment of his Executive
Dy: Com! sanctioned
his appointment temporarily
subject to his confirmation
during the ganachundy. In
December 185 Rangappa
petitioned the Dy: Com!
praying that he might be
continued in charge of
Circle No: 1 until Kuramappa
could officiate personally.
In 1886 the Dy: Com! passed
an order to the effect that
as Rangappa agreed to the
appointment of Kuramappa
for Circle No: 1 under protest
as recorded by the ganachundy
Officer on the Potagistakta"
and as Kuramappa
(whom Ramachundrappa
stated in 1879 that he did
not want any of the Circles
for himself or for his
son, Rangappa should
continue in charge of
Circle No: 1, and Kuramappa
should be directed to
contest this right if any,
by a regular suit. Since
~~Kuramappa agreed to~~
~~the Office, stating that~~
~~the post of Circle Patels~~
~~was hereditary~~ in 1879
to those any of the Circles
~~hereditary~~ in his or in
~~Rangappa's~~ the latter's
absence, ~~Kuramappa~~
desires ~~this~~ his hereditary
right ~~and has accordingly~~
~~petitioned the Government~~
~~accordingly~~

Rangamappa (the appellant)
Contests the Validity of the
Dy: Com! order of 30 August 1886.
The Diwan in dismissing
that Ramachandrappa's refusal
recited in the Order of the
refusal, that the son (Rangamappa)
was registered at the Patel
Settlement as Heriditary

Office: Of the Sotaji Taleti,
Rangapa & Appellant
are equal Hukdars.
Whereas
Appellant Executive,
~~has Recorded Katha~~
is the Registered Hukdar
~~Officiator~~ of Circle No: 1 Cuddapah
Petitioner Rangappa has
been ~~his~~ Executive since
the Sotaji settlement, ~~being~~
~~to the minority of the Hukdar~~
That Rangappa Regarded
himself as Executive is
quite clear from the records,
and especially from his
Petition dated the 28th Dec 33.
Contempt was to ~~usurp~~ the
office in his own right, is
most reprehensible, and
must fail. ~~Under such~~
~~circumstances~~, the Dy: Coll's
Order No: 591/33 dt 30th August 34
is cancelled, and Executive
must be placed in charge
of the office if found qualified
therefor. If he be not quite
qualified, ~~I cannot do~~ the Dy: Coll's Order
~~to~~ appoint temporarily
a Executive other than the
Counter Petitioner Rangappa, whose further Continuance in
the Office cannot be beneficial to the real interests of the Hukdars

Chitaldrug
5/8/35

To
The Dy: Coll: Chittoor
Sitting Cuddapah.
Enclosed is Petition

(General Serial No. 30)

1888.

From

To Hon'y Comm'r Thompson

Dated 5 August/88

Despatched 8 —

Received

Enclosures No. V

General No. 3821

No. 56

Read: without any Enclos:

F.O. 20/8/93.